REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1-21 are rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants traverse these rejections and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,279 to O'Neil et al., (hereinafter "O'Neil"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,748,448 to Barrera et al., (hereinafter "Barrera"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,543,066 to Colasurdo. Claims 1-21 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,954,783 to Bodwell et al., (hereinafter "Bodwell") and further in view of Colasurdo. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 recites in part:

> A method of accessing data from a plurality of servers comprising:
>
> receiving ***a request for the data*** from a client computer;
>
> receiving the data from the first server;
>
> ***modifying the data*** by adding an identity of the first server to a portion of the data that would initiate a subsequent request from the client computer;
>
> forwarding ***the modified data*** to the client computer wherein subsequent requests received from the client computer include said first server identity;

Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, suggest or describe at least the identified subject matter.

Applicants agree with the Examiner's assessment that O'Neil does not describe at least adding an identity of the first server to the data. *See* Office Action at page 7. Applicants additionally agree that neither Barerra nor Bodwell disclose at least the limitation 'wherein subsequent requests received from the client include the first server identity and sending each of the subsequent requests to the first server' as claimed. *See* Office Action at pages 8 and 14. However, Applicants submit that none of the cited references disclose the 'modifying' and

'adding' limitation of the rejected claims.

Claim 1 Defines Over the Combination Including Barrera

Barrera discloses using a URL addressing scheme for efficiently accessing resource files on a networked server system. *See* Barrera, column 4, lines 10-25. Barrera discloses a sequence of steps, in which a URL address is *sent* as part of an instruction request *to the host server* to initiate the locating of the requested file. Barrera does not disclose at least using a URL address as part of a retrieval process to be sent to the *requesting* party but rather describes *a client browser sending a request* with a URL link. The request is passed on *to the server as part of the request*. *See* Barrera, column 8, lines 40-62.

Thus Barrera is directed to sending data from a client computer to a server. Nothing in Barrera discloses modifying the requested data and forwarding the modified data to the requestor as described in the rejected claims of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Barrera fails to suggest or disclose at least the 'modifying' and 'adding' limitation of the rejected claims.

Claim 1 Defines Over the Combination Including Bodwell

Bodwell describes utilizing a software program of an intermediate server to forward user requests for a target web server through an intermediate server. The cited portion of Bodwell recites in part:

> The HTML and other content is modified so that most interactions or requests made by the user from the mediated content are routed through intermediate server 10 rather than going directly to the target web server 30. [Bodwell at 5:6-9].
>
> In the case of absolute URLs, software program 5 will embed the name of target web server 30 in the file portion of the mediated URL, preceded by a special identifier. The special identifier is used ***so that if a user sends a command requesting the mediated URL, software program 5 will be able to locate the name of target web server 30.*** ... In this case, requests for the target web server www.utexas.edu ***will be routed*** through a host "site1.server.com" ***at intermediate server*** 10. The host "path1.server.com" can be used to define a particular target web server 30 associated with web page 35. "company*" is the special indicator which allows

> software program 5 to locate the target server www.utexas.edu in the file name. Software program 5 can then forward user requests for target web server www.utexas.edu to that target web server. It should be noted that ***target web server*** www.utexas.edu (e.g. target web server 30 for this particular request) ***may be different than target web server 30 for the user's previous request***. [Bodwell at 4:64-5:18].

Thus in Bodwell, a software program, and therefore the intermediate server, redirect client requests of the web page to the target web server. 'Adding the identity of a first server to the data' and 'forwarding the modified data to the client computer' as claimed is not the same as adding the identity of an unrelated intermediate server to information transmitted to the target server as recited in Bodwell. In the cited example, the software program embeds the name of the target server, but does not forward the requested file including the identity of a server *to a client computer* as described in claim 1. The embedding (of the target server's name and the special identifier) described in Bodwell is directed to communication between an intermediate server and a target server to achieve the end of routing all future requests of the relevant target server through the relevant intermediate server. It fails to describe at least modifying the data by adding an identity of a server to the data and forwarding the modified data to a client computer wherein subsequent requests received from the client computer include said first server identity and sending each of said subsequent requests to said first server altogether. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Bodwell fails to suggest or disclose the identified limitations of the rejected claims.

Claim 1 Defines Over the Combination Including Colasurdo

The Office Action identifies Colasurdo as allegedly remedying the deficiencies of the combination of O'Neil, Barerra, and Bodwell. In particular, the Office Action indicates that Colasurdo discloses "modifying the requested data" as recited in rejected claim 1. *See* Office Action at pages 3-5. The cited and other relevant portions of Colasurdo recite in part:

> Cookies are small *pieces of data that a server sends to a client* machine and that the client's Web browser knows to store in a designated cookie folder or in the browser memory. Thereafter, when that client sends a http request for a Web page to that server, the client's Web browser software sends the cookies associated

> with that URL to the server. [Colasurdo at 3:15-21].
>
> When a server creates a session, it assigns a unique session ID value *that is sent back top [sic] the client machine* under the name jsessionid. Thereafter, *the client machine will include the session Id in all requests issued to that server farm*. The session ID might be sent in a cookie that forms part of the request. Alternately, it *might be appended to the URI of the request* in a mechanism known as URL rewriting. [Colasurdo at 4:6-13].
>
> As another example, the invention can be applied in a URL rewriting environment. As is well known to those of skill in Java programming, another way of indicating a particular session to which a request belongs is commonly termed URL rewriting. In URL rewriting, instead of using jsessionid cookies, the session Identification *code is merely appended at the end of the URI* as a parameter with the name jsessionid. … Operation in accordance with the present invention is essentially the same as described above in connection with the embodiment in which session identification data is maintained with the use of jsessionid cookies. [Colasurdo at 10:28-44].

Thus Colasurdo discloses a session ID that is transmitted by the client machine as part of the request wherein the session ID defines a set of related requests. Colasurdo discloses nothing more than modifying a session ID that may be sent to the client, for example as a cookie or appended to the URI for original request, for use in subsequent requests. This is not the same as modifying the requested data by adding an identity of the first server to a portion of the data that would be used to initiate a subsequent request from the client computer and forwarding the modified data to the client computer as claimed in the rejected claims.

Conclusion

In order to support a proper § 103(a) rejection, the cited references must include a similar teaching, suggestion or description of every element of the rejected claims. For at least the above reasons, Applicants maintain neither the combination of O'Neil, Barrera, and Colasurdo nor the combination of O'Neil, Bodwell, and Colasurdo disclose every limitation of claim 1. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 is lacking and should be withdrawn. Likewise, independent claims 8 and 15 include similar limitations and are allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons. Claims 2-7,

9-14, and 16-21 depend from and further define allowable independent claims 1, 8, and 15 respectively, and therefore are allowable as well.

For at least the above reasons, it is believed that this Response places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Response is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: December 19, 2011

By: /Michelle McLeod/
Michelle McLeod

(Reg. No. 63,282)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1801 Page Mill Road, Suite 210
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Telephone: (650) 384-4700
Facsimile: (650) 384-4701